

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Patent Application of:	)	Confirmation No.: 9517
Shunpei YAMAZAKI	)	
Application No.: 10/769,821	)	Examiner: James Lin
Filed: February 3, 2004	)	Group Art Unit: 1715
For: METHOD OF MANUFACTURING A DISPLAY	)	
DEVICE	)	

**RESPONSE**

**Mail Stop Amendment**

United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Customer Service Window  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Dear Sir:

The Office Action mailed March 9, 2011, has been received and its contents carefully noted. This response is filed within three months of the mailing date of the Office Action and therefore is believed to be timely without extension of time. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that this response is being timely filed.

An Information Disclosure Statement is submitted herewith and consideration of this Information Disclosure Statement is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4-9 and 12 are pending in the present application, of which claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 are independent. For the reasons set forth in detail below, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Paragraph 3 of the Office Action rejects claims 4 and 6 as obvious based on the combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,051,150 to Miyakawa, U.S. Patent No. 5,368,897 to Kurihara, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0129902 to Babayan, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0049876 to Mori and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0001992 to Kawase. Paragraph 4 of the Office Action rejects claims 1 and 9 as obvious based on the combination of Miyakawa, Kurihara, Babayan, Mori, Kawase and JP 11-340129 to Seki. Paragraph 5 of the Office Action rejects claims 5, 7, 8 and 12 as obvious based on the combination of Miyakawa, Kurihara, Babayan, Mori, Kawase and JP 07-024579 to Inoue. Paragraph 6 of the Office Action rejects claim 2 as obvious based on the